

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-13 and 16-20 are currently pending.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,314,108 to Ramasubramani et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0044771 A1 to Allred et al. Applicants have reviewed the Office Action and the claims and traverses the rejection. Applicants have argued the differences between the claims and Ramasubramani and those arguments are incorporated here by reference and will not be repeated unless necessary. As previously stated, Applicants' claims are directed to a persistent connection between the proxy on the network and the server. The claims clearly state that the persistent connection is with the server and the proxy and not between the server and the client, which is a different connection within the network. .

In the Office Action it is acknowledged that Ramasubramani does not disclose that the claimed persistent connections are active and established connections between the proxy and server. To this end, the Office Action cites to Allred. Applicants have reviewed the reference and the sections cited and respectfully traverses that Allred overcomes the deficiencies of Ramasubramani. Allred is directed to a method and apparatus for a connection manager. By providing for persistent connections with clients, the connection manager allows for servers to communicate with clients, which would otherwise be inaccessible.

The Office Action points to paragraphs [0003] and [0005] to suggest that Allred discloses the persistent connection between the proxy and the server. These paragraphs disclose the persistent connection and specifically states that the persistent connection is between the disclosed client and server. As is understood by those of ordinary skill in the art the client is an endpoint within a connection similar as to a user. This is supported by the Allred's FIGs., e.g. FIGs. 1 and 4. As stated previously, it is understood in the art that persistent connections are known between a network and an end point in the operation in the network.

In other words, Applicants do not see a distinction between the persistent connection disclosed and in Ramasubramani and that disclosed by Allred. Applicants' claims do not focus on the connections from the wireless communication devices or client devices into the proxy and the Internet. While Allred does focus on persistent connections between the client and the server, it does not state that these persistent connections are between the proxy and the server. Therefore, there is nothing in Ramasubramani and Allred to suggest that the connections are not needed to be created between the proxy and the server each time a wireless connection device or client device requests access to the server.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ramasubramani and Allred does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the claimed apparatus, system and method that focus on the persistent connections between the proxy and the one or more servers. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 13 are not patentable over Ramasubramani and Allred. As claims 2, 4-5 and 7 depend on claim 1, claims 9 and 11-12 depend on claim 8 and claims 16-20 depend on claim 13, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited combination for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of Allred and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,167,926 to Boucher et al. Claims 3 and 6 depend on claim 1 and claim 10 depends on claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit the dependent claims are patentable over the cited combination as neither Ramasubramani nor Boucher are directed to the persistent connections between the proxy and the servers on which objects are for the reasons given above with respect to the rejection under Section 102(b). Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that

Serial No.10/840,053
Bedekar et al
Case No. CE10624R

any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bedekar, Anand S., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750